

Appl. No. 09/882,983  
Final Amendment and Response  
Reply to final Office action of January 3, 2005

### REMARKS

This Amendment and Response After Final is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 3, 2005. Claims 1-13 are pending, of which claims 1-4, and 8-13 are rejected while claims 5-7 are objected to. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following discussion the Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and thus reconsideration of the pending application is earnestly solicited.

#### Claims having allowable subject matter

The Office action provides that claims 5-7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. In response, claim 6 is amended to include all of the limitations of its base claims. Claim 7 retains its original form and dependency on claim 6. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 6-7 is respectfully requested.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office action rejects claims 1-4 and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over S. Jung, U.S. Patent number 6,412,952, "CRT Coupling Apparatus of Projection Television." That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office action takes the incorrect position that S. Jung discloses two springs, and cites column 2, lines 40-58 as supporting that proposition. However, Jung does not teach a combination of two springs. Column 2, lines 40-58 clearly describe a single spring wire 14 being coupled to a bracket 12; no second spring is disclosed or suggested. Consequently a mechanical coupling means for coupling first and second springs together as recited in independent claim 1, or a first attaching means for coupling first and second spring elements together as recited in independent claim 11, are not taught by or are obvious from Jung.

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 484, 486 (CCPA 1970). MPEP 2143.03.

**Appl. No. 09/862,983**  
**Final Amendment and Response**  
**Reply to final Office action of January 3, 2005**

Consequently, since Jung does not teach or suggest either a second spring or a mechanical coupling means (or attaching means) for coupling first and second springs together, independent claims 1 and 11 are allowable. Furthermore, claims 2-10 and 12-13 are also allowable at least for their dependency on allowable base claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1-13 is respectfully requested.

Referring now to claim 2, that claim is allowable for depending from an allowable base (independent claim 1). Furthermore, claim 2 is allowable for the additional reason that Jung does not disclose sheet metal springs, a feature recited in claim 2. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Referring now to claim 4, that claim is allowable for depending from an allowable base (independent claim 1). Furthermore, claim 4 is allowable for the additional reason that Jung does not disclose a U-shaped spring that is terminated at each end with a mounting flange, features recited in claim 4. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Referring now to claim 10, that claim is allowable for depending from an allowable base (independent claim 1). Furthermore, claim 10 is allowable for the additional reason that Jung does not disclose a resilient seal that is juxtaposed between a CRT and a coupler such that lateral movement of one to the other is inhibited. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/882,983  
Final Amendment and Response  
Reply to final Office action of January 3, 2005


### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant believes that the subject application is in condition for allowance. The Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and reexamine the subject application. An early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone call would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the Mr. Eric Bram at (914) 333-9635. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the address of record (not to the signing attorney).

Dated: February 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
John M. Kelly, Esq.  
Registration No.: 33,920  
211 B Eatoncrest Drive  
Eatontown, New Jersey  
(202) 744-4787